SAVING RURAL ONTARIO: PLANNING FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ONTARIO'S COUNTRYSIDE LANDSCAPE

Ron Brown

Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute
Toronto, Ontario

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 6
June 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION 1

B. THE EVOLUTION OF ONTARIO'S HERITAGE LANDSCAPE:..... 2
THE RESOURCE

C. THREATS TO ONTARIO'S HERITAGE LANDSCAPES;..... 8
THE ACTORS

D. BARRIERS TO HERITAGE PRESERVATION:..... 10
THE PLANNING FRAMEWORK

E. OVERCOMING THE BARRIERS: 15
INITIATIVES TO DATE

F. SAVING ONTARIO'S PAST:..... 17
THE ALTERNATIVES

NOTE ON THE AUTHOR

SAVING RURAL ONTARIO: PLANNING FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ONTARIO'S COUNTRYSIDE LANDSCAPES

A. INTRODUCTION

While controversy swirled around the preservation of Toronto's Don Jail, the demolition of the rural hamlet of Mayfield went unnoticed. In nommage to the car the municipality of Peel "improved" the Mayfield intersection by bulldozing much of the pioneer crossroads buildings into dust. Peel is not unusual. While the attention of planners and historians focussed on heritage buildings in such urban centres as Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, Fergus, Guelph and Chatham, the pioneer log farms of the Ottawa Valley, the tree-lined roads of Central Ontario and the cross-roads hamlets of Peel lie unprotected and foregotten.

Even though much of Ontario's heritage lies in its rural roots, historical buildings and landscapes in Ontario's countryside enjoy no protection. Ontario's planning process ignores them.

The purpose of this paper therefore is to document this problem. It will show the range of heritage features in Ontario's rural areas, how Ontario's planning process is biased against their protection, and ways they may be saved. The threats to Ontario's, and Canada's rural heritage are challenges that planners must soon accept or bear responsibility for its disappearance.

B. THE EVOLUTION OF ONTARIO'S HERITAGE LANDSCAPE: THE RESOURCE

Ontario's landscape has been one of many changes. Since the 1790's it has undergone several phases of development and each phase has produced distinctive features. Although landscapes affiliated with each phase usually obliterated those of the previous phase, some relics of older phases have survived with those of the new. These however are few. Landscapes from the early pioneer and military eras as well as those from the later railway, lumbering and mining eras are nearly non-existent. Today's dominant landscape results largely from the era of 19th century agricultural expansion. Yet even these, as the economics of agriculture change, are disappearing.

Governor John Graves Simcoe's Military phase witnessed a network of wilderness forts linked by bush trails and surrounded by farmers and craftsmen. Relics of this phase have virtually vanished. Military roads have been modernized or have disappeared and earthenworks ploughed under. One exception is the Willow Creek Depot and the Nine-Mile Portage. During the War of 1812 the main military route from York to Georgian Bay followed Yonge Street to Lake Simcoe and then a nine mile protage from the head of Kempenfeldt Bay (now Barrie) to a depot on Willow Creek, thence to the Nottawasaga River and Georgian Bay. However shortly after hostilities ceased, the Penetanguishene Military Road replaced the Nine-Mile Portage route.

While the Penetang Road has been modernized in this century the Nine-Mile Portage fell into disuse. Traces, however, appear in fields and woodlots while at the Depot the road is well defined as are many Depot earthworks.

Military relics survive only where they are restored and actively preserved. Although the Nottawasaga Conservation Authority commenced restoration of the Depot, it failed to maintain it. As a result, the Depot, like other military relics, is falling victim to its greatest enemies, weather and vandals.

Then the Pioneer Phase saw water power sites attract mill villages while lakeshore anchorages bustled with schooners. From these nodes the forest clearings grew. Although most mill villages succumbed to heavy spring floods and low summer flows wrought by the removal of the forests, a few representative landscapes survive. In Lanark County the villages of Beales Mills, Motts Mills and Bellamy Mills survive as ghost towns. In Grey County where the pioneer phase is more recent mill villages such as Traverston have survived partially intact.

Most of Ontario's present rural landscapes derive from the Agricultural Phase, a period which left a strong imprint. Mennonite farms, for example, are characterized by their "Grossdawdy" house, a second house attached to the original to house a retired grandfather or "Grossdawdy". Throughout Ontario prosperous dairy regions produced large homes of red or yellow brick. Stone houses reflect the proliferation of that building material.

Barn styles too show regional variations. For example, the stoney soils of Wellington county produced a concentration of unusual stone barns while the rigours of the Canadian Shield have left a legacy of simple log barns. In the Ottawa Valley log homes and barns create a unique pioneer landscape. Most common however are small hay barns or squat barns of brown or red planking.

While the 19th century barn still dominates, they are being replaced by aluminum barns. Log buildings, the most striking landscape remnant of 19th century Ontario, are fast falling prey to scavengers or movers.

Pioneers constructed fences of the most readily available material. From sand plains they wrenched great pine stumps to line their roads and fields. Where cedar abounded they split it and laid it out in an imaginative variety of fence styles. From stoney morainic hills came sturdy stone fences.

Then during the late 1800's farmers were paid to line public roads with trees. These provided wind breaks from the then open fields. Although maples were the most popular, the stately elm whose curving limbs saved them from the sawmill also arched over many country roads. In all areas except the Ottawa Valley the elm has long succumbed to Dutch elm disease. Although many south-western Ontario backroads still retain their lines of maples, and the Ottawa Valley its split rail fences, roads engineers in growing municipalities such as Durham, York and Peel are converting these shady country lanes into feature-less four-lane roads.

In the days of horse-drawn transport country stores required proximity to the customer. Major road intersections gradually acquired a nucleation of buildings required by the rural population: a store, post office, blacksmith, and other craftsmen. Sometimes a hotel provided liquid respite while an order was being filled. Then with the advent of the car road widening and intersection "improvements" took their toll and many one-time crossroads villages are now little more than asphalted intersections flanked by gas stations.

Cheese factories were a ubiquitous rural industry. Especially numerous in eastern Ontario between Belleville and Ottawa factories were small and varied in architectural style. Gradually competition, farm abandonment, and urbanization closed smaller factories. Although a few survive as sheds or homes, most have been demolished.

Fortunately there are two categories of rural relics in little danger; the country school and the church. When in the 1960's the province of Ontario sealed the fate of the country school through centralization they appeared destined to vanish from the landscape. Instead there followed a rush to buy the buildings for residences. While a small percentage have been altered beyond recognition, most retain their original appearance. Churches likewise die hard. Although rural congregations are a fraction of their earlier size, they have clung tenaciously to their country churches. However early pioneer log or frame churches are seldom seen. In most cases an original building was quickly replaced by one of brick or stone.

Other rural institutions, the Orange Lodge and the community centre were less fortunate. With the rapid decline of the Orange Order in the present century and with the movement of recreation to larger towns many of these buildings, neglected, disappeared.

Railways and canals wrought further landscape changes. Smaller canals such as the Grand, Rideau and Trent by providing economical transportation stimulated lockside villages.

Railways were more pervasive. By 1880, a dense network of raillines had criss-crossed southern Ontario bringing a boom to railside villages and doom to backwater villages. To serve rural needs the railways provided rural stations with elevators, mills and cattle yards. Occasionally a few dwellings produced a hamlet at the site.

Railway companies however have demonstrated little appreciation of their heritage features. Once disused, trestles, stations and elevators have been demolished. If rural stations survive it is usually due to the efforts of local groups to provide an alternative use. A restaurant in the rural station of Craigleith is one example.

Even the road pattern itself represents a heritage imprint. Despite Ontario's topographic obstacles, 18th and 19th century roads surveyors superimposed an uncompromising grid patterns of roads. Where different survey patterns met or where errors occurred jogs and gores resulted. Throughout the province the original country road was little more than a narrow dirt trail rising and falling with the landscape. Corduroy traversed swamps, crude log bridges the creeks and ravines.

Today's modern road reconstruction has all but eliminated the pioneer road. Here and there where re-alignments have bypassed the old road or where township roads have been closed, pioneer roads remain. One unique pioneer road project was the colonization road.

By mid-19th century southern Ontario's farmlands were full. In 1857 the provincial government of what is now Ontario, to entice settlers northward onto the Canadian Shield, designed a network of colonization roads with free land grants. After a few years the infertile soils and harsh climate drove away most settlers and left a unique landscape. Unlike the grid patterns over the remainder of southern Ontario these roads snaked irregularly around hill and swamp. Crude log shanties and small villages dotted their length. While in some areas revitalization through tourism has severely altered this landscape, many remain unchanged. Along some, overgrown fields and ghost towns exist. Along others, original pioneer building and fences remain in use and in place.

Mining and lumbering landscapes rarely extended beyond the camp and mill sites. Mining began with the 19th century mineral boom in eastern Ontario involving gold, graphite, corundum and iron while lumbering spread northward throughout the last half of the 19th century. When production ended camp buildings were demolished or rotted and little in the way of a heritage landscape remained. A few interesting exceptions have survived and lurk yet in isolated forest clearings.

The post-war years gave birth to the automotive era. This more than any other development altered, indeed devastated, the rural landscapes of Ontario's pioneer years. Requirements for commuting and high-speed travel widened and straightened twisting country roads. Tree and fence-lines fell and many road-hugging hamlet homes and shops were demolished. Gas stations replaced blacksmith shops and new commercial centres entered intersections.

Despite the rapid disappearance of many of Ontario's rural landscapes, few persons or agencies have rallied to the cause of those which survive. Perhaps it is because few know of their existence or appreciate their plight. Even landowners are often unaware of the heritage value of their own buildings and thus improvements they make either destroy or fail to compliment those buildings.

No less ignorant of the plight of Ontario's rural heritage are the many levels of government and large corporations which demolish, cut, burn, or bury vestiges of Ontario's rural past.

C. THREATS TO ONTARIO'S RURAL LANDSCAPE: THE ACTORS

The perpetrators of Ontario's rural destruction range from the small to the large, the ignorant to the knowing.

The fact of farm economics has altered the farmscape. Striving to maximize their efficiency Ontario's farmers have in most cases, ripped out the tree-lines and fence-rows which demarkated the small fields of the pioneer farm. Increasingly they are replacing the traditional wooden barn with modern aluminum structures.

Many a rural intersection has undergone alteration for the same reason. Redundant pioneer craft or blacksmith shops have given way to gas stations or take-out restaurants.

More culpable is the roads engineer. To satisfy increasingly rigid road standards, he has straightened out winding country roads, cut down their shady canopies and carted away the pioneer log or stump fences, all to the glory of a speeding auto. Although provincial roads engineers are showing signs of recognizing Ontario's traditional landscapes in their redesigning, the municipal engineers remain uniformly content to slash and demolish.

Many other federal and provincial property holders have shown little concern for the heritage value of their holdings. While this has been most noted in urban areas -- the destruction of the old Queen Street Mental Health Centre by the Ontario government being of recent controversy -- the problem occurs in rural areas. The Ministry of Natural Resources for example has a policy to destroy disused buildings on Crown Land. Heritage is only of selective concern.

Most insensitive are corporations. Because their buildings have been traditional community foci, banks and railways have received the most criticism. And justly so. In countless centres unique 19th century bank architecture has been replaced by glass and concrete squares. Railways too have ignored local pleas and have carted away handsome old stations. Although these problems are wholly urban, small rural stations have been swept away in the maelstrom.

Finally there is a unique phenomenon. While claiming to be a preserver of pioneer Ontario, the log home builder gleefully disassembles pioneer log buildings for reconstruction on cottage lots or in chalet subdivisions. What he disregards is that once the structure leaves the site of its heritage role, usually the farmstead, half its heritage value has vanished while the landscape loses its heritage value entirely.

To date little recognition is given these problems. Not only is Ontario's heritage landscape vanishing, but so much of the preservation controversy has swirled around urban areas that the plight of the rural landscape is ignored.

D. BARRIERS TO HERITAGE PRESERVATION: THE PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Ironically the greatest threat to Ontario's built heritage is the legislation enacted to protect it.

Heritage preservation is a provincial responsibility. In Ontario the Ontario Heritage Act of 1974 provides the legislative basis for preserving Ontario's heritage. Unfortunately it fails. While retaining no preservation power at the provincial level, the Act places the onus for preservation upon the municipalities. Yet the Act deprives them too of the power to preserve. In fact through a confusing list of preconditions the Act discourages most municipalities from initiating heritage programs. Specifically only those municipalities with approved official plans and Local Advisory Committees on Architectural Conservation have the power to designate heritage buildings. Designation of heritage districts requires more: special studies and secondary plans. Then, even once the buildings and districts are designated the municipality has no power to actually prevent their demolition. The Act permits them only to delay demolition for up to two hundred and seventy days while trying to persuade the owner to retain the building. After that time the Municipality is powerless to stop the owner from destroying even the most prized of buildings.

If the Heritage Act discourages urban municipalities from heritage planning, it deprives most rural municipalities of that power completely. Much of Ontario's rural built heritage falls within townships that either have no official plan and therefore are ineligible to designate heritage structures, or are within unorganized townships that have no municipal government at all. Legislatively therefore most of Ontario's rural heritage is completely unprotected. Furthermore the Act prevents the provincial government from acting to designate and preserve heritage sites other than ruins. It is little wonder that Heritage Canada once described Ontario's heritage legislation as being amongst the weakest in the western world.

Another relevant statute is the Ontario Planning Act. Under Section 13 it permits municipalities to adopt official plans containing land use designations. Development must conform to the relevant policy. Further the Planning Act gives municipalities control over land use zoning, control over demolition and control over new development. However official plans and zoning bylaws are not compulsory and many rural municipalities have neither.

A third statute with heritage implications is the Environmental Assessment Act. At present it requires only major government projects to include an environmental assessment. However this Act could if extended, require any size project, public or private to preserve or protect rural heritage features which would be affected. Only recently has the Ministry of Transportation and Communications begun submitting major highway projects to environmental review.

However although the protection of traditional tree and fence lines from highway improvements is now possible it is seldom practised. Furthermore regional and local roads projects, such as those devastating Peel, by reason of their lower capital cost remain immune from the provisions of the Environmental Assessment Act.

Three government agencies have program mandates which affect Ontario's rural heritage. These are the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ministry of Culture and Recreation and the conservation Authorities. Although the Ministry of Natural Resources may incorporate heritage themes into Ontario Provincial Parks master plans, this is seldom exercised within provincial parks and cannot be applied outside park boundaries. Instead, MNR demolishes its heritage buildings. The Ministry of Culture and Recreation administers the Historical Parks Act. Under this Act the minister can establish and administer parks with exclusively historical themes. At present however it administers only two, Ste. Marie Among the Hurons and the Penetang Naval Establishment. Because of its "park" aspect this mandate is inappropriate for landscape preservation. Also in this Ministry is the Ontario Heritage Foundation. While it may receive gifts and issue grants, it cannot initiate landscape preservation. Third, Conservation Authorities are an association of municipalities concerned primarily with watershed conservation. Many however administer "pioneer villages" consisting of local heritage buildings removed from original and possibly endangered sites. The integrity of these buildings is diminished somewhat by their having been removed from the location of their heritage role. Because of their watershed focus, many pioneer mills fall within Authority boundaries. To their credit authorities have usually

preserved them and have often made them an historical focus of recreational parks. This program applies only to those parts of the province with conservation authorities. Unorganized townships cannot participate.

Federal heritage legislation and mandates are narrower in scope than those of the province. The most relevant statute however is the National Parks Act. Under it the federal government may acquire features and sites of national interest. Historical initiatives include Upper Canada Village and the Rideau Canal. Formerly under the Department of Transport, as are all other canals, the Rideau Canal came under Parks Canada because of its high national historical interest. To encourage compatible land use adjacent to the canal, Parks Canada entered into an A.R.C.* agreement with the province of Ontario. This joint venture, which also included the Trent and Severn Canals, (known as C.O.R.T.S.*) intended to prepare a plan which would eventually preserve the aesthetic and historical landscape features of these waterways. However in its final draft stage the plan was trimmed to exclude historical preservation.

Although under the National Historical Sites and Monuments Act Parks Canada may also plaque heritage features, this offers no protection against demolition or alteration.

---

* Agreements on Recreation and Conservation

* Canada Ontario Rideau Trent Severn

Federal projects involving heritage buildings owned by the federal government are subject to review. The Federal Advisory and Coordinating Committee on Heritage Conservation reviews and makes recommendations on heritage preservation. However federal agencies are neither obliged to submit their projects for review nor to follow the recommendations of the F.A.C.C.H.C. Furthermore, federally-regulated buildings such as railway stations are exempt.

Another statute, on the surface unrelated, is the federal Income Tax Act. While this Act provides for tax concessions where a building owner demolishes his building, costs involved in restoring heritage buildings are not tax deductible. It is therefore a statute which encourages demolition rather than the preservation of heritage buildings.

The conclusion to this overview is less than optimistic. Ontario's rural heritage is disappearing and will continue to disappear.

Heritage legislation bars most rural municipalities from protecting cherished historical features. Those few municipalities which can protect them tend to concentrate on urban rather than rural features. Indirect legislation offers little protection, and one, the Income Tax Act, in fact encourages demolition.

Various government agencies provide grants which could be used, among other projects, for heritage preservation. These include Canada Works, the former LIP grants which encourage local jobs; the former Neighbourhood Improvement Program and Residential and Rehabilitation Assistance Action Program grants administered provincially by the Ministry of Housing to upgrade housing and

neighbourhoods; the Ministry of Housing's downtown improvement funding programs to stimulate the economic revitalization of downtown commercial areas. Wintario grants too are eligible for heritage preservation. There are also various private grants. There are however none specifically for rural heritage preservation, and therefore none to encourage efforts towards that end.

E. OVERCOMING THE BARRIERS: INITIATIVES TO DATE

In the absence of legislation or policy encouragement the existence of any rural preservation initiative is remarkable. The following stand out for that reason.

To date the most pertinent local initiative has been the Hastings Road project. The Hastings Road, the first of Ontario's colonization roads into the Ottawa-Huron Tract, boomed with settlement between the years 1857 and 1867. Then infertile soil, adverse climate and a dwindling market combined with the lure of the west to depopulate most of the road. Soon only sagging log cabins and quiet ghost towns were left. In 1974 the Hastings County Museum developed a unique concept. It would, in conjunction with local municipalities, reconstruct a live-in pioneer community based on the conditions of the original Hastings Road. Students would restore log cabins, inhabit them and live and work as the pioneers lived and worked. Canada Works funded initial feasibility studies. However the local municipalities became uneasy. The road they felt rather than be a "pioneer village" should be widened to attract more tourists and their dollars. This fundamental split had by 1978 doomed the project and it never resurfaced. It was nevertheless a unique initiative specifically to preserve a rural heritage landscape.

It was not however the first concept based upon a colonization road. In 1966 a Renfrew county group tried to develop the Opeongo Road, the best preserved of all Ontario's colonization roads, as a hiking trail and pioneer museum piece. But funding failed and it too was abandonned.

The third example of rural landscape preservation comes from Prince Edward County. The County planner designated in the Official Plan "scenic roads". Siting and density of development along them was controlled. Although preservation of specific heritage features was not included in the provisions this example illustrates that the official plan process can be a viable format for ensuring that new development is compatible with rural landscapes.

Several official plans include policies pertaining to heritage designations in accordance with the Heritage Act but these pertain to urban rather than rural situations.

Other site-specific efforts have helped preserve particular rural features. Rural mills for example have always been a key historical element of the rural landscape. In many places local Conservation Authorities have preserved rural mills and their ponds. The Balls Falls Conservation Area, once a bustling village, now contains the old mill as a museum, a picnic area and old buildings moved from other sites. The Backus Mill near Simcoe, Ontario, with its surviving water wheel is Ontario's oldest mill. Around the Lang Mill near Peterborough the Otonabee Authority developed a pioneer village. Generally where conservation authorities exist rural mills have been preserved. Unfortunately much of Ontario is not covered by conservation authorities and here the mills lie subject to floods or demolition or the whims of their owners.

Another Ontario government agency, the Ministry of Culture and Recreation, has embarked upon certain rural heritage initiatives. Their study, "Straight Lines in Curved Space" has documented the heritage features of the Opeongo Colonization Road. Other M.C.R. studies have documented lumbering and mining camps. But despite the level of detail in these studies that ministry lacks the mandate to preserve these landscapes.

Most of these initiatives are worthy. They are however too few and far between. Improved publicity, more legislative and financial encouragement may result in more such efforts.

F. SAVING ONTARIO'S PAST: THE ALTERNATIVES

The lead agency in an effort to preserve Ontario's rural landscapes must be the Ministry of Culture and Recreation. It administers heritage matters, it has the power to amend The Heritage Act, and to grant funds through the Heritage Foundation or Wintario. However the programs and policies of various other agencies must also be amended to support any lead taken by M.C.R. Finally there are roles for individuals, planners and non-governmental institutions to promote identification of and preservation of Ontario's rural heritage.

The Ministry of Culture and Recreation to date has been study-oriented and has produced many sound documents. However as a first step toward recognizing and promoting Ontario's rural heritage preservation that ministry should compile and publish a comprehensive inventory of Ontario's rural heritage landscapes and features. In it the ministry can advise individuals or municipalities of actions they may take using existing legislation and funding.

As a second and more important step M.C.S. must amend the Heritage Act. This Act, justly criticized for its weaknesses, should enable all interested municipalities to actually protect heritage features rather than merely delay the day they will lose them. Specifically it should strengthen designation power so that it means preservation rather than merely delay of demolition. The legislation also should remove the provision that only those municipalities with an official plan may designate historical features. In unorganized territory where no local government exists the Ministry itself must assume the mandate to preserve heritage features. Finally the Ministry should encourage the establishment of LACAC's in rural as well as urban areas to help rural municipal governments identify important features.

Other provincial agency programs and legislation should also be altered to reflect a commitment to heritage protection. The Minister of the Environment should amend The Environmental Assessment Act to ensure that all projects both private and public are subject to a heritage impact review. The Minister of Housing should amend The Planning Act to allow heritage preservation as grounds for demolition and development control and encourage those municipalities with planning programs to incorporate rural heritage policies similar to those in Prince Edward County.

The Ministry of Transportation and Communications should incorporate into highway improvement criteria the preservation of tree and fence lines and through grants available in the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act encourage local roads departments to do the same. The Ministry of Natural Resources should abandon its policy of demolishing historical buildings on Crown Lanc

Instead, it should preserve former lumbering and mining buildings. Through District Land Use Plans and through provincial parks masterplans district planners should develop these features as historical themes.

At the federal level Parks Canada should expand the scope of the A.R.C. program. It should identify rural landscapes of national heritage significance (e.g. The Rideau Waterway, the Loyalist settlements along Lake Ontario) and enter into joint land use planning programs with the provincial government. Resulting land use policies would ensure that key heritage elements are preserved and that new development is compatible with the heritage landscape.

Other federal statutes and programs should also change. For instance the mandate of the FACCHC should expand beyond federally-owned lands to include all federally regulated lands. It should be mandatory to submit all federal projects to the FACCHC, and its recommendations should be binding. The need to amend the Income Tax Act is critical so that tax incentives encourage the restoration of rather than the demolition of heritage buildings.

Although indirect funds exist for heritage projects (e.g. Wintario, Canada Council) specific funds, from, for example, the Ontario Heritage Foundation or Heritage Canada, should specifically apply to the preservation of special heritage landscapes and the restoration of heritage features located thereon.

Given their past record it is naive to count upon the federal or provincial governments to initiate heritage saving amendemnts. Individuals on the other hand are often eager. Many initiatives are open to concerned individuals. One is to document and publicize rural heritage features in a particular community. Through a community newspaper or local printer, this will increase appreciation of rural heritage features at the community level. Further the individual can speak out at planning board meetings against proposals which might adversely effect those features. Where official plan or zoning proposals threaten heritage preservation the individual can ask the minister of Housing to refer the proposal to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Local groups such as a LACAC, an historical society, or a museum organization can lobby local governments to incorporate heritage preservation into their programs. For example they can pressure roads departments to halt the destruction of fence and tree lines as well as pioneer roadside buildings. And to give the local voice some strength the Ministry of Culture and Recreation can build into an amended Heritage Act a mechanism whereby local groups and individuals can appeal any project which threatens a heritage feature. Finally local groups can plaque key heritage features to increase local pride and appreciation.

Planning institutions such as universities and community colleges have a special role to play. Because they are removed from political pressures they can initiate non-partisan and critical class projects which address issues or sites. Queens University for example has studied and published documents on the Loyalist settlements of the eastern Lake Ontario region.

Ryerson Polytechnical Institute publishes an Occasional Paper series through its Urban and Regional Planning Department. In smaller communities, those more affiliated with a rural hinterland, such institutions have a higher profile and can therefore play a stronger role vis a vis community involvement in heritage preservation.

The individual planner has perhaps the most strategic role to play. The planner at the local level has the mandate to offer professional input to the decision-making process. He or she can thereby encourage and even draft local policy changes to encourage heritage preservation. He or she can also in an official capacity recommend to planning colleagues in provincial agencies legislative amendments to support local initiatives. He or she is also part of a dialogue with the public including those who won heritage features. For these owners the planner can identify important features and encourage preservation. Finally, the planner, through professional organizations can publish or speak out on the neglect and dangers confronting Ontario's vanishing rural heritage.

Hopefully the planner will play his role to full advantage. For once these vestiges of pioneer Ontario are gone, they are gone forever.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ron Brown is a 1968 Masters graduate from Regional Planning and Resource Management at the University of Waterloo and is a 9 year member of the Canadian Institute of Planners. He has worked as a town planner in Trinidad and helped create cooperative development schemes in the Jonestown area of Guyana. More recently he has participated in the Ontario government's Design for Development planning program and the CORTS (Canada-Ontario-Rideau-Trent-Severn) planning exercise. His interest in rural Ontario's built heritage has resulted in two articles in the Canadian Geographic Journal and a book "The Ghost Towns of Ontario".

Additional copies of this paper are available, at no charge from:

Editor, Occasional Papers Series
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute
50 Gould Street
Toronto, Ontario M5B 1E8

The Editors wish to thank Doug Watanabe, a 3rd year Urban and Regional Planning student at Ryerson for the cover design and preparation.